# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

1. Project Number (Assigned by federal unit):118-412_ Alvi	OUNT REQUESTED <u>\$47,312</u>
2. Project Name: Cow Creek Restoration (RM 46-49) Pha	se I 3. County: <u>Douglas</u>
4. Project Sponsor: Douglas SWCD	5. Date: April 15, 2003
6. Sponsors Phone #: <u>541-957-5061</u>	
7. Sponsor's E-mail: walter-gayner@or.nacdnet.org	
8. Project Location (attach project area maps showing general and spec	rific locations of project.)
a. 4 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #:	17100302
	South Umpqua River
b. 5 <sup>th</sup> Field Watershed Name and HUC #:	1710030207
	Middle Cow Creek
c. Legal Location:	
Township 32S Range 5W	Section(s) <u>19-21, 30</u>
Township 32S Range 6W	Section(s)25
	Resource Area Glendale
f. National Forest g. Forest	st Service District
h. State / Private / other lands involved? <b>X Yes</b>	No

### 9. Statement of Project Goals and Objectives:

The goals and objectives of this phase of the project are to survey 3 miles of stream on Cow Creek (River Mile 46 to 49) and determine appropriate restoration activities that will stabilize the system to reduce streambank erosion, increase riparian vegetation, improve aquatic habitat, and protect resource lands. The landowners in this area are part of the working group that formed during the Middle Cow Creek Watershed Assessment and Action Plan development.

This area has been unstable for many years. As seen from the aerial photos, the system is very wide and "bounces" within its banks. There are many active knick points that are eroding at rates higher than normal and effective vegetation for shade and soil retention is not present. There are significant federal land holdings in this watershed though most of the project area is private.

Douglas SWCD is working on some specific locations that are in need of improvement (Martin Ditch and Reeves Streambank Erosion). However, these are individual locations that are part of a larger problem.

October 23, 2002

## Title II Project Application

### Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

#### 10. Project Description:

A watershed assessment was conducted by the Umpqua Basin Watershed Council and generated a considerable amount of interest from local residents. UBWC has asked that Douglas SWCD carry on work with that same group.

Phase I actions are listed in outline form.

- 1. Develop a list of landowners whose lands are directly touched by the creek.
- 2. Hold a stakeholder meeting to communicate intent and generate interest in participating.
- 3. Contact landowners and arrange for access to the property.
- 4. Conduct a survey of the reach by physically walking the section and developing a written data log with photographs of the conditions.
- 5. Develop concept designs of all the viable options.
- 6. Meet with landowners to determine which options are favorable to the landowners.
- 7. The end result of this phase will be concept designs for all locations needing formal definition so EA's can be completed. Submit the concept designs to BLM so Environmental Assessments (EA's) can be completed.

Phase II (future work)

Appropriate solutions for this reach will be implemented and may include tree plantings, log placement, boulder clusters, weirs, rock barbs, brush mattresses, bank shaping, livestock exclusion, off-channel stock water systems, and anything else that is a viable option.

#### 11. Coordination of this project with other related project(s) on adjacent lands?

X Yes No

This "bigger picture" project will incorporate two active, individual projects in the area and build on them.

#### 12. How does proposed project meet purposes of the Legislation? [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

Improves maintenance of existing infrastructure. [Sec. 2(b)]

- X Implements stewardship objectives that enhance forest ecosystems. [Sec. 2(b)]
- X Restores and improves land health. [Sec. 2(b)]
- X Restores water quality. [Sec. 2(b)]

Dand Maintenance IC 2(1)(2)(1)

#### **13. Project Type (check one)** [Sec. 203(b)(1)]

Road Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	Traff Maintenance [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
Road Decommission/Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]	Trail Obliteration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
Other Infrastructure Maintenance (specify):	[Sec. 2(b)(2)(A)]
Soil Productivity Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(B)]	Forest Health Improvement [Sec. 2(b)(2)(C)]
X Watershed Restoration & Mntc. [Sec. 2(b)(2)(D)]	Wildlife Habitat Restoration [Sec. 2(b)(2)(E)]

Trail Maintenance IC 241/21/41

# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

14.	Measure of	f Proj	ect Accom	plishments/Ex	pected (	Outcomes [	Sec. 2	203(b)(5	(
-----	------------	--------	-----------	---------------	----------	------------	--------	----------	---

a.	Total Acres: N/A	b. Total Miles: <u>approx. 3 miles of stream</u>
c.	No. Structures: <u>To Be Determined</u>	d. Estimated People Reached (for environmental
		education projects):
e.	No. of Laborer Days: approx. 95	<u> </u>
f.	Other (specify):	
g.	Program Element: JG	

### 15. Duration of Project and Estimated Completion Date [Sec. 203(b)(2)]:

Phase I of the project will start as soon as funding is secured and be completed by 12/31/04.

#### 16. Target Species (plants/wildlife etc.) Benefited: (if applicable)

This reach has been documented to be a proven salmonid producer and part of a transportation route to other parts of the watershed. Supplemental flow from Galesville Reservoir keeps this reach watered and desirable habitat for fish throughout the watershed.

# 17. How will cooperative relationships among people that use federal lands be improved? [Sec. 2(b)(3)]

The project outreach and education will emphasize the importance of looking at watersheds instead of individual ownership. This will help people understand the need for cooperation between public and private landowners.

#### 18. How is this project in the best public interest? [Sec. 203(b)(7)] Identify benefits to communities?

This project will improve water quality and fish and wildlife habitat. Local contractors will be used on any design and construction contracting. In addition, protecting productive resources like agricultural lands is also good for local communities.

#### 19. How does project benefit federal lands/resources?

Water quality, fish migration, and noxious weeds are three important issues that ignore land ownership. Even though this work is on private lands, improving fish habitat is beneficial to federal lands within the same watershed.

# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

### 20. Status of Project Planning

a. NEPA Complete:	Yes	X No	
b. If No, give est. date of completion: NEPA work will	ll be comp	leted afte	er this phase is complete.
c. NMFS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	Yes	X No	Not Applicable
d. USFWS Sec. 7 ESA Consultation Complete:	Yes	X No	Not Applicable
e. Survey & Manage Complete:	Yes	X No	Not Applicable
f. DSL/ODFW* Permits Obtained:	Yes	X No	Not Applicable
g. DLS/COE* 404 Fill/Removal Permit Obtained:	Yes	X No	Not Applicable
h. SHPO* Concurrence Received:	Yes	X No	Not Applicable
i. Project Design(s) Completed:	Yes	X No	Not Applicable

<sup>\*</sup> DSL = Dept. of State Lands, ODFW = Oregon Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, COE = Army Corps of Engineers, SHPO = State Historic Preservation Officer

### 21. Proposed Method(s) of Accomplishment

X Contract Federal Workforce County Workforce Volunteers

X Other (specify): <u>Douglas SWCD staff</u>

**22.** Will the Project Generate Merchantable Materials? (Sec. 204(e)(3)) Yes X No

# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

#### 23. Anticipated Project Costs [Sec. 203(b)(3)]

- a. Total County Title II Funds Requested: \$ 47,312.00
- b. Is this a multi-year funding request? X Yes No If yes, then display by fiscal year

e. FY04 Request: \$ <u>\$47,312.00</u>

f. FY05 Request: \$ unknown at this time; costs are to be based on planning results

g. FY06 Request: \$ \_\_\_\_\_

	Fed. Agency Appropriated Contribution	Requested County Title II Contribution	Other Contributions	Total Available
Item	[Sec. 203(b)(4)]	[Sec. 203(b)(4)]	[Sec. 203(b)(4)]	Funds
24. Field Work & Site Surveys				
	\$ 1,600.00	\$ 1,560.00	\$ 0.00	\$3,160.00
25. NEPA & Sec.7 ESA Consultation				
	\$ 4,400.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 14,400
26. Permit Acquisition				
	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
27. Project Design & Engineering				
20. G	\$0.00	\$ 22,940.00	\$ 1,800.00	\$24,740.00
28. Contract Preparation	<b>*</b> • • • •	<b>#</b> 0.00	Φ 0 00	<b>#</b> 0.00
20. G. 4. 4.1	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
29. Contract Administration	¢ 0 00	¢ 2 007 00	0.00	¢ 2 007 00
30. Contract Cost	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,887.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 3,887.00
30. Contract Cost	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
31. Workforce Cost	\$ 640.00	\$ 4,475.00	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 7,815.00
31. Workforce Cost	\$ 040.00	\$ 4,473.00	\$ 2,700.00	\$ 7,813.00
32. Materials & Supplies				
32. Waterials & Supplies	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
33. Monitoring	Ψ 0.00	ψ 0.00	ψ 0.00	ψ 0.00
or manuering	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
34. Other – Rental charges for Azalea	<b>\$ 0.00</b>	\$ 5.00	\$ 5.00	\$ 0.00
Grange, (2) Stakeholder meetings.	\$ 0.00	\$ 150.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 150.00
35. Project Subtotal	\$ 6,640.00	\$ 43,012	\$ 4,500.00	\$54,153.00
36. Indirect Costs (Overhead) (per		\$4,300	-	-
year for multiple year projects)	\$ 0.00	ĺ	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00
37. Total Cost Estimate				
	\$ 6,640.00	\$ 47,312	\$ 4,500.00	\$58,452.00

#### 38. Identify Source(s) of Other Funding in Column C. Above [Sec. 203(b)(4)]

The landowners will be providing some support through this project. Additional contributions from the landowners will come in the later stages as well.

# Title II Project Application Medford District Resource Advisory Committee

#### 39. Monitoring Plan (Sec.203 (b)(6)

a. What measures or evaluations will be made to determine how well the proposed project meets the desired ecological conditions? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

Douglas SWCD will set project benchmarks such as miles of stream surveyed, number of identified sites needing correction, and concept designs developed. The goal will be to survey the entire three mile reach, identify all sites needing attention, and develop options for all of those sites.

b. How will the project be evaluated to determine how well the proposed project contributes towards local employment and/or training opportunities, including summer youth jobs programs such as the Youth Conservation Corps? [Sec. 203(b)(6)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

Because this phase is devoted to survey, design, and NEPA, employment opportunities are limited. However, people from the local work force will be used whe never possible and appropriate. Douglas SWCD will be responsible for ensuring these goals are met.

c. What methods and measures of evaluation will be established to determine how well the proposed project improves the use of, or added value to, any products removed from National Forest System lands consistent with the purposes of this Act? [Sec. 203(b)(6) and Sec. 204(e)(3)] Who will be responsible for this monitoring item?

This project will have no impact on use of products from the National Forest System.

d. Identify total funding needed to carry out specified monitoring tasks (Table 1, Item 33)

Amount: 0.00